

REMARKS

The following is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 3, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 3, 2008. The Examiner objects to claims 1, 10, 17 and 26 for a typographical error in the newly amended limitation "less than the total area of the display" to "less than the total area of the display." The Examiner also objects to claim 27 to change the limitation "change the size the window" to read "change the size of the window" The Examiner rejects claims 27, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bauer (U.S. 2003/0197739). The Examiner also rejects claim 1, 6-8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 22-24, 26, 39-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bauer in view of Brooks (6,008,809).

Claim Objections

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 17, 26 and 27 to eliminate the objections raised by the Examiner. Therefore, these objections should now be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant submits that each of the pending claims recites as an affirmative step of creating and saving window area boundaries. The Examiner takes the position that this is not sufficiently affirmatively recited and that therefore, the claims can be rejected as anticipated by Bauer. In fact, Bauer only teaches modifying the window area at paragraph [0023] and other parts of the reference. The modified window in Bauer cannot be saved and there is no teaching that the modified window is saved. However, to clearly establish this distinction in the Examiner's interpretation, the claim language has been modified to emphasize that the window area, established by user input, is saved and can be recalled at a future time for reuse. Further, Applicant has added a number of dependent claims, all with substantially the same wording, which clearly recite that one or more applications may be associated with the defined window area and that the association may be saved in

memory. Again, no such feature is taught or suggested in Bauer. Therefore, the rejected claims must be allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

As set forth above, Bauer does not teach saving window boundaries, which are based on user input, or associating an application with such a defined window area and save that association. Brooks only teaches a dynamic window in a window area and a unique system in which each application is dragged into the window area. The placement of each application within the window area is uniquely determined by the side of the window over which the application window is dragged (see column 9, lines 18-22 of Brooks). See also column 7, lines 54 to column 8, line 3 of Brooks, which includes a clear teaching that the dynamic window must be expressly called each time the user wishes to use it, and then the user must select, drag and drop the application into the dynamic window. As the foregoing shows, Brooks fails to cure the deficiencies of Bauer set forth above.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, Applicants believe that they have overcome all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed September 3, 2008, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Sheridan
Registration No. 25,435
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant